

~~SECRET~~5. First Policy
5317th December, 1959.COCOM Document 3714.60/2COORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONONITEM 1460 - AIRCRAFT7th December, 1959

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Docs. Nos. 3700.1, 3714.00/1, 3714.60/1 and W.P. 1460/1 - 3.

1. At the opening of the second round of discussion, the UNITED STATES Delegation, in an endeavour to meet the aims behind the United Kingdom and French proposals for this item and to place all countries on an equal footing as regards the export of aero-engines, suggested that the new part (b) as set out in paragraph 2 of COCOM Doc. No. 3714.60/1 be revised to read:

"Aero-engines.

(NOTE: Governments may as administrative exceptions approve for use in civilian aircraft in the Bloc reasonable numbers of (1) aero-engines of turbo-prop, turbo-shaft and turbo-jet types and series (excluding military configurations) which are the standard engines of aircraft excepted from embargo under (a)(1) and (a)(2) in this definition or are equivalent to the standard engines of such aircraft in basic characteristics, performance and technology and are usable thereon (See Interpretative Note) and (2) piston type engines. As used in the Note the term "standard engines" refers to the engine or engines which have been specified by the aircraft manufacturer for the aircraft and which have been normally or frequently used thereon. (Exports authorised by Governments as administrative exceptions under this procedure should be reported to the Committee in the monthly statistical returns.)"

In addition, they recommended that, in order to assure that consistent up-to-date practice obtain under the above Note, the Committee agree to establish in an Interpretative Note a list of the "standard engines" for the non-embargoed aircraft and of related other engines which met the characteristics set forth in the Note. Nominations for changes to bring such a list up to date could be made at any time. They further recommended that, recognising that there might be some need to embargo certain types of piston engines, Governments would consider sympathetically any proposals to embargo such specific piston type engines under the above Note as further examination of the problem might warrant.

2. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegation welcomed the constructive proposal put forward by the United States Delegation, but were unable to give views there and then. The basic difference between this approach and that adopted in the French and United Kingdom proposals was that, in drawing up the suggested Interpretative Note, it would be considerably difficult to decide on the degree of equivalence to apply. In the absence of any clear criteria, a great deal of

discussion would result for each individual proposal to add to the list of exclusions. They tentatively suggested a compromise such as the addition of a third clause to the United States Note covering the whole class of turbo-prop and turbo-shaft type engines with a maximum power of 2,000 h.p., just as piston engines were covered in part (2) of the Note. All other types of engines could then be dealt with in the manner described in the United States proposal.

3. The FRENCH Delegation also wished to give further study to the United States suggestion in paragraph 1 above. They reserved their position as to the establishing of a list, and wished to know on what criteria it would be based before giving views. They themselves believed that the horse-power cut-off was an adequate criterion in the case of turbo-prop or turbo-shaft type engines of under 1,200 h.p., which could not be used to equip military aircraft. In the case of such engines, they would not be able to agree to any listing other than a purely illustrative one.

4. The UNITED STATES Delegation appreciated the suggestions made by the United Kingdom and French Delegations. If small horse-power engines could meet the tests specified in the Note proposed by the United States Delegation, and, assuming that the remarks of the French Delegation concerning 1,200 h.p. engines were also applicable to engines of 2,500 h.p., the United States Delegation would be able to accept on an ad referendum basis the suggestions relating to engines having a maximum of 2,500 h.p. which had been in production for over two years. The United States Delegation would envisage the United Kingdom proposal, however, not as a third clause in the proposed Note but rather as a first section under which to identify the appropriate engines in the Interpretative Note suggested by the United States Delegation. The latter would prefer in this connection that all specific engines be listed and appropriately identified in order that there would be no question of shipping engines not specifically identified. They also pointed out the impossibility of pre-judging engines not now in existence, indicating that such engines might be developed for non-civilian use. This emphasised the desirability of including in the Interpretative Note specific engines currently being produced. The United States Delegation further stated that their acceptance of the United Kingdom proposal to delete aero-engines from sub-item (a) would, of course, be dependent upon agreement being reached on the re-definition of aero-engines under sub-item (b). However, since later discussion revealed that engines between 1,200 and 2,500 h.p. were not solely used on civilian planes, the United States Delegation re-directed the Committee's attention to the proposal of the French Delegation.

5. The ITALIAN Delegation considered the United States proposal to be a good basis for discussion, and had no fundamental objection to the idea of listing standard engines. The GERMAN Delegation were also sympathetically disposed to the establishing of a list, especially since it could be re-examined at the time of the annual List Review. They would naturally wish to see exactly what it would contain before giving a final view.

6. After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed that no final views could be given immediately on the United States proposal. Delegates undertook to examine the latter fully, but felt that it would be necessary to draw up a tentative list before taking up a final position. The possibility of establishing criteria as suggested by the French Delegation might also be studied, and the whole question reopened early the following year.

7. CONCLUSION : The COMMITTEE therefore agreed that, although the present definition of Item 1460 was unsatisfactory, it would remain unchanged if no agreement were reached on the 18th December. In that event, the matter would be rediscussed before the end of January 1960.